



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,974	07/15/1999	VIKTORS BERTIS	AT9-99-123	4395

35525 7590 08/07/2006

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

TO, JENNIFER N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/353,974	BERSTIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer N. To	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are pended for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anti-cult "Cache Directories – delete them sometimes"- "alt.religion.scientology", 01/30/1997, and in view of Kesinger "Two very simple solution", "comp.infosystems.www.authoring.html", 10/26/1995.

4. Anti-cult and Kesinger were cited in the previous office action.

5. As per claims 1, 9-11, and 19-21, Anti-cult teaches the invention substantially as claimed including:

initiating a session with the browser (using the Netscape browser to start a session);

requesting a first web page (in order to encrypt a web page, a step of requesting a webpage must be included. Anti-cult teaches encrypting a web page, therefore Anti-cult inherently teaches requesting a first web page);

receiving the web page (in order to encrypt a web page, the steps of requesting a webpage, and receiving the web page must be included. Anti-cult teaches encrypting a web page, therefore Anti-cult inherently teaches receiving the web page);

encrypting the web page (the Netscape cache directory is in an encrypted device drive. The encrypted device drive encrypts the web page received by Netscape); and

caching the web page (the default option of the Netscape browser is to cache the received web page. Anti-cult put the Netscape cache in the encrypted device drive. As such, the encrypted device driver automatically encrypts the received web page before caching it in the Netscape browser cache directory). In addition, Anti-cult teaches the decryption of the cache content prior to the usage by the browser.

Anti-cult did not specifically teach encrypting/decrypting the web page using encryption/decryption provided by the browser for the browser cache.

6. Kesinger explicitly suggested that "the browser could encrypt/decrypt the files in the cache". As such, Kesinger teaches the usage of a browser implemented method to encrypt/decrypt the browser cache.

7. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Anti-cult and Kesinger because Kesinger teaching of using a browser implemented method to encrypt the browser

Art Unit: 2195

cache would improve the integrity of Anti-cult's system by dynamically encrypt/ decrypt cache information.

8. As per claims 2, 4, 12 and 14 Kesinger teaches coding the web page using a browser supported encryption algorithm (the usage of the browser to encrypt the web page in the browser's cache).

9. As per claims 3, and 13 Anti-cult teaches the encryption is not supported by the browser (the encrypted device drive's encryption program is outside the control of Netscape).

10. As per claims 5, and 15, Anti-cult teaches that wherein the step of caching the web page further comprises providing a remote cache location (Netscape allows user to select any location as the cache location).

11. As per claims 7, and 17, Anti-cult teaches defining a path for storing the web page that directs the web page to memory locations for encrypted data (Netscape cache directory to the encrypted device drive by defining the path thereto).

12. As per claims 8, and 18, Ant-cult teaches that wherein web page information that is cached and then paged is paged as encrypted web page information (the web page

information is cached and pages in the encrypted device drive as a encrypted web page information).

13. As per claim 22, Anti-cult and Kesinger did not specifically teach the browser cache include system memory cache and disk memory cache. However, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include system memory cache and disk memory cache in the browser cache.

14. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anti-cult "Cache Directories – delete them sometimes"-["alt.religion.scientology"](#), 01/30/1997, in view of Kesinger "Two very simple solution", ["comp.infosystems.www.authoring.html"](#), 10/26/1995, as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis "Sharing Netscape cache?", ["comp.unix.admin"](#), 6/4/1997.

15. Davis was cited in the previous office action.

16. As per claims 6 and 16, Anti-cult and Kesinger teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Anti-cult and Kesinger did not specifically teach the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users.

17. However, Davis teaches the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users (Unix version of Netscape create a cache in a user's own directory

Art Unit: 2195

and only the user can access the Netscape's cache. The user directory is password protected from unauthorized users).

18. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Anti-cult, Kesinger and Davis because Davis teaching of the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users would improved the integrity of Ant-cult and Kesinger's system by providing a secure environment to share a cache directory between multiple users.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

20. In the remark, applicant argued that Anti-cult fails to teach that the encryption/decryption is provided by the browser for the browser. The new ground of rejection shown that Kesinger teaches the encryption/decryption is provided by the browser for the browser (see paragraphs 6-7 above for details).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Himmel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6453342), and Spraggs (U.S. Patent No. 6941454)

teach the encryption/decryption is provided by the browser for the browser.

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer N. To
Examiner
Art Unit 2195



LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER